THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON.

The Remonstrance is addressed to the Legislatures of the several States by Women Remonstrants against the extension of the suffrage to women. It expresses the views of such Remonstrants in Massachusetts, Maine, New York, Illinois, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

A STUBBORN FACT.

"In these parlor speeches no one uses the word sex in its true meaning, but always as a compliment or a slur. But it is a fact, and the most complete and stubborn one in nature; and you have to go very low down in nature indeed before the two sexes become one in the same individual. It is the great fact of nature, for without it there would be no world, no country to govern. You cannot make the child-bearer the same as the breadwinner, and she ought not to be made so. . . . Now, some of her sisters and brothers, misled by words, wish to drive her out into the world's work, yet expect of her the old grace, the delicate touch for babyhood and death, the ready emotion for sorrow and pain. For it follows as the night the day that this painful duty of guiding the state means, in our civilization, at least, that she must fight, and fight hard, must learn who and what the men are for whom she casts her vote, must go to the primaries, must sit on juries — and yet never give up her *real rights*, those that are 'the Lord's work,' of being the life-giver, of keeping a happy corner where the weary can rest, of keeping men — who naturally relapse into barbarism when left too long alone — keyed to the more delicate harmonies of life. Can they do both? I say they cannot. And some of the very women who are working hardest in this matter are proofs to me of the impossibility of combining all the work of the world in one frail sex." — *H. deK. G., in The Critic.*

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1892.

Municipal suffrage bills were defeated in Massachusetts, Iowa, and Vermont. A license suffrage bill was defeated in Massachusetts. Petitioners for Presidential suffrage were given leave to withdraw in Rhode Island, Iowa, and Massachusetts. School suffrage bills failed of enactment in Kentucky, Iowa, and Ohio.

IN 1893.

In Arizona, the House passed a bill giving full suffrage to women by a vote of 16 to 7, but it failed in the other branch.

In Arkansas, a school suffrage bill passed the Senate but was tabled in the House.

In California, a school suffrage bill passed the House by a vote of 42 to 27 and the Senate by a vote of 31 to 6, but was vetoed by the Governor.

In Connecticut, a bill permitting women to vote on the license question was defeated.

In Illinois, a township suffrage bill, permitting women to vote for supervisors, town clerks, assessors, and highway commissioners, also to participate and vote in all town meetings, was passed by the Senate but failed in the House.

In Indiana, municipal suffrage bills were introduced in both branches of the Legislature, but failed to pass.

In Maine, the House, by a vote of 48 to 75, defeated a municipal suffrage bill, which had passed the Senate.

In Massachusetts, a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women was amended by a provision requiring that before taking effect it should be accepted by a majority of the men and women of the State. This amendment, which was recognized as hostile to the bill, was adopted by a vote of 110 to 90, and the bill as amended was defeated, yeas 101, nays 111, including 14 pairs.

In Michigan, a municipal suffrage bill was enacted but was pronounced unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

In Minnesota, a municipal suffrage bill, so amended as to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution, passed the Senate but was killed in the House.

In Missouri, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House: yeas 45, nays 68.

In New Mexico, a bill conferring full suffrage upon women passed the House but did not reach a vote in the other branch.

In New York, the only suffrage bill which reached a vote was one allowing women to vote in village elections, which was defeated in the Senate, April 3. The Supreme Court decided that the law passed by the Legislature of 1892, permitting women to vote for school commissioners, was unconstitutional.

In North Dakota, a suffrage bill was passed by the House but was afterward reconsidered and the earlier vote was expunged from the records.

In South Dakota, a bill giving women municipal suffrage was passed by the Senate but was defeated in the lower legislative branch, 27 yeas to 50 nays.

In the United States Senate, October 16, an amendment to strike out the word "male" from the qualifications of voters at the municipal elections to be held in that part of Oklahoma known as the Cherokee Outlet, was defeated; yeas 9, nays 40.

IN 1894.

In Massachusetts, a municipal suffrage bill was passed by the House but was defeated in the Senate.

In New York, a proposition to submit to the people an amendment to the Constitution, striking out the word "male," was defeated in the Constitutional Convention, August 15, yeas 58, nays 97.

In Kansas, a constitutional amendment giving to women full rights of suffrage, was defeated at the election, November 6, by a majority of 34,827.

In Vermont, the House, after first acting favorably on a municipal suffrage bill, rejected it by a close vote, and subsequently by a majority of 28 refused to reconsider this action.

In Iowa, the Senate defeated a proposition to submit a suffrage constitutional amendment to the people.

In New Jersey, the Supreme Court rendered a decision that the Constitution of that State debars women from voting.

GROUNDS OF REMONSTRANCE.

THE following protest, addressed by women of New York to the Constitutional Convention of that State, expresses briefly and forcibly some of the reasons which lead the great majority of American women to object to having the responsibilities of the ballot thrust upon them: —

We, American women, citizens of the State of New York, protest against the proposal to impose the obligation of suffrage upon the women of this State, for the following, among other reasons: —

1. Because suffrage is to be regarded not as a privilege to be enjoyed, but as a duty to be performed.

2. Because hitherto the women of this state have enjoyed exemption from this burdensome duty, and no adequate reason has been assigned for depriving them of that immunity.

3. Because conferring suffrage upon the women who claim it would impose suffrage upon the many women who neither desire it as a privilege nor regard it as their duty.

4. Because the need of America is not an increased quantity, but an improved quality of the vote, and there is no adequate reason to believe that woman's suffrage by doubling the vote will improve its quality.

5. Because the household, not the individual, is the unit of the State, and the vast majority of women are represented by household suffrage.

6. Because the women not so represented suffer no practical injustice which giving the suffrage will remedy.

7. Because equality in character does not imply similarity in function, and the duties and life of men and women are divinely ordered to be different in the State as in the home.

8. Because the energies of women are engrossed by their present duties and interests, from which men cannot relieve them, and it is better for the community that they devote their energies to the more efficient performance of their present work than to divert them to new fields of activity.

9. Because political equality will deprive woman of special privileges hitherto accorded to her by law.

10. Because suffrage logically involves the holding of public office, and office-holding is inconsistent with the duties of most women.

WHERE ARE THE BENEFITS?

I HAVE read with some care all the obtainable essays and speeches in behalf of the amendment, and have sought in vain for the statement of a single certain, well-defined benefit which is to result either to the State or to womankind. Glittering generalities, fantastic speculations, socialistic theories, populist fallacies, I find in plenty, but I find the statement of no wrong to woman that man has refused to redress — of no provision for her benefit that he has refused to make — I find no business or profession closed to her — no barrier interposed to her development and advance in any direction in which her sex permits her to direct her footsteps.

The law of this State already accords to women, as it rightly should, many special privileges and immunities, and has removed the trammels which in years gone by confined her freedom of action.

If there still be grievances to be redressed, of which we hear no mention, it is to the Legislature that appeal should be made, and until it has shown, as it has not yet done, an indisposition to act upon any reasonable complaint, there will be no necessity for an appeal to the ballot-box. — *Francis M. Scott, Esq., New York City.*

SHOULD NOT BE THRUST ON WOMEN.

THE women urging suffrage for their sex have not all their sex with them. Suffrage is not a matter to thrust on unwilling recipients. When the property qualification for voting was wiped out in New York State, none benefited by that result repelled the ballot. When negroes were made voters, none of them opposed the act. To push a privilege or an obligation on protesting persons is destructive of the very theory on which it has been conferred. A woman has the same right to be against suffrage as for it. It is as wrong to force it on her against her will as it would be to disfranchise a man without cause against his will.

It may be said that if women must unanimously desire suffrage for any woman to get it, the sex will never obtain it. That is so. But suffrage should not be imposed on women until a large preponderance of them wish it, and such preponderance should be moral and intellectual as well as numerical. The remonstrants have this advantage over the suffragists: *All women who neither sign for suffrage nor sign against it must be presumed to be against it.* To get it requires a radical change in the basis of government. Those who do not ask for such a change are against it, for if they do not ask it they do not want it. It is immaterial how many or how few sign on either side of the question unless the signatures for one or the other side represent a very decided majority of all the women of the State. — *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle, May 6, 1894.*

WHAT IF IT FAILS?

A RECENT correspondent who is opposed to female suffrage declares that he is "willing to see the experiment tried." If it fails, what then? He must remember that a suffrage once enlarged *can never be contracted.* As long as the great majority of thoughtful and conscientious women do not desire to be voters, jurymen or officeholders, why force the burden upon them? — *Rev. Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D.*

THE DEFEAT IN KANSAS.

THE defeat of the suffrage amendment in Kansas was highly significant. For years, women in Kansas have participated in municipal elections on the same terms as men. The spectacle of women on the stump, in political conventions, and at the polls is one with which the people of the State have become familiar. If woman suffrage in operation is the excellent thing it is represented to be, it would seem that the voters of Kansas would be eager to extend it. So far from that, after a vigorous campaign in which suffrage forces from various parts of the country were concentrated, Kansas voters rejected the suffrage amendment by a majority of more than thirty-four thousand. One feature of the campaign which deserves notice is that the most active suffrage leaders, Miss Anthony and Mrs. Shaw, openly allied themselves with the Populists in return for Popnlist support for the amendment. This alliance seems not to have worked well in Kansas; and the impression which it made upon conservative people in the East, who regarded the Populist vagaries as most dangerous, was not favorable.

NO TIME FOR NEW RISKS.

If we do not feel certain that Woman Suffrage would be advantageous, then we must feel certain that its establishment would be a risk. And at this particular time our city and state and country have risks enough to deal with. It is not a time for new risks, for additional uncertainties, for probable or even possible disturbances which can in any way be avoided.

There is a homely proverb: "Do not swap horses while you are crossing a stream"; wait for a quieter time. . . . Woman Suffrage is an utterly unknown horse. It has never been tested in any way which indicates how it would work in a city and state like ours. Colorado and New Zealand are being held up for our imitation. But their experience has been too brief to prove anything. The experience of Wyoming has not been so encouraging as the advocates of suffrage here desire us to believe. . . . Some people are passionately asserting that they know it would work well just here and now — even that they know just how it would work well. But they have no right to assert this unless they claim the gift of inerrant prophecy. They have no proved reasons, no tangible endorsements, to give for what they call their knowledge. — *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer.*

WHY NEW JERSEY ABANDONED IT.

The claim is made that "woman suffrage has worked beneficially wherever tried." It was tried in New Jersey. On July 2, 1776, the provincial assembly conferred the suffrage upon women; in 1797 seventy-five women voted; and in the presidential election of 1800 a large number availed themselves of the privilege. At first the law was construed to admit single women only, but afterward it was made to include females eighteen years old, married or single, without distinction of race. In the spring of 1807 a special election was held in Essex County to decide on the location of the courthouse and jail Newark and vicinity struggled to retain the county buildings; Elizabethtown to remove them. The contest waxed warm, and, according to a paper on "The Origin, Practice, and Prohibition of Female Suffrage in New Jersey," read by the Hon. William A. Whitehead, Corresponding Secretary of the New Jersey Historical Society, —

"It was soon found, though only women of full age, possessing the required property qualification, were permitted by judges of election to vote, that every married woman in the county was not only 'of full age,' but also 'worth fifty pounds proclamation money clear estate,' and as such entitled to vote if they chose. And not only once, but as often as, by change of dress or complicity of the inspectors, they might be able to repeat the process. . . . In Acquackanonk township, thought to contain about 300 voters, over 1,800 votes were polled, all but seven in the interest of Newark."

One woman voted three times. Her name was Mary Johnson, and she cast her first vote under that name. Afterward, as a somewhat stouter-looking woman, she voted as Mary Still, and later in the day as a corpulent person, whose name was Mary Yet. The Legislature set aside the election as fraudulent, and the whole State was so disgusted that an act was passed restricting the suffrage to white male citizens twenty-one years of age. — *Rev. J. M. Buckley, D.D., in The Century for August.*

TAXATION AND REPRESENTATION.

"But," says a woman who seeks to be a voter, "I own property, and I pay taxes on it, and I cannot think that taxation without representation is just." This plea has been repeated so often that it is time to point out its fallacy. There are two kinds of taxes — a money tax, and a service tax. The money tax is levied on property, men's and women's alike, pro rata. The service tax is levied on men alone. It calls for jury service, police service, military service, and every man takes his chances on it. Sometimes one goes through his seventy years without suffering from it at all; again he spends weary hours in the jury-room, or he is sworn in as a special constable to quell a riot and fight a mob, or he is called to camp and battlefield, where he may lose a limb, or an eye, or his life. Representation goes with this kind of taxation, and not with the other. Property is protected by the government, as women are; but property, whether man's or woman's, has no representation. If it had, it must necessarily be in some degree proportional. Mr. Astor would have hundreds of times as many votes as I, and I, perhaps, would have twice as many as the man that sweeps out my office. — *Rossiter Johnson.*

THE CONTEST IN NEW YORK.

The advocates of woman suffrage made a strong effort to persuade the New York Constitutional Convention to submit a proposition to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution. Large numbers of petitions were presented to the convention, and public hearings were had. But the women of the State who were averse to having the responsibilities of the suffrage thrust upon them made an earnest remonstrance. Committees were formed in Brooklyn, New York, Albany, Rochester, and other cities to present the objections of the thoughtful and conservative women of the State. Thirty-five different counties and ninety-four cities, towns, and villages were represented in the remonstrances sent to the convention. For a movement which had no previous organization and which was carried on for only a few weeks, this protest was very effective. The committee of the convention reported against the suffrage proposition, 4 to 13. August 15, the convention rejected the amendment, 58 to 97. The conclusion expressed on the floor of the convention and elsewhere was that the great majority of the women of the State were either utterly indifferent to the amendment or totally opposed to it.

DOUBLING WOMAN'S BURDENS.

There are long periods in the lives of women when they find their ordinary duties very heavy, and now a few eager ones wish to double this burden. It is little comfort to me to have them say, as many of them do not hesitate to say: "Oh, you need n't vote if you don't want to, but you ought to let *us* vote!" Not at all. I want that you should not force me to neglect my obvious duties in order to vote, when I believe we are both better without it. You are the aggressor. You should show good reason for interfering with my liberty. — *H. de K. G., in The Critic.*

A BACKWARD STEP.

The first thought that strikes us in considering the woman-suffrage movement is, that it is a proposition to engage women once more in that "struggle" from which civilization has enabled them in great measure to escape: and that its effect, if long continued and fairly tried, will be to check the development of woman as such, and to bring to bear on her influences of a kind different from those which have been hitherto active. — *Prof. Edward D. Cope, in Popular Science Monthly.*

LOSING GROUND IN VERMONT.

THAT the suffrage cause is losing ground in Vermont is indicated by the recent vote of the Vermont Legislature. In 1892 the House passed a municipal suffrage bill, yeas 149, nays 83, and it was defeated two weeks later in the Senate. Last November, on the other hand, the House, after ordering the bill to a third reading by the comparatively close vote of 120 to 106, defeated it later by 106 to 108, and subsequently refused reconsideration by a vote of 96 to 124. In other words, a favorable majority of 66 in 1892 was changed into an adverse majority of 28 in 1894.

A BLANK CARTRIDGE BALLOT.

THE most civilized portions of mankind have not yet outgrown the measurement of force for the ultimate settlement of every great question, and the unit of force is the man capable of bearing arms. As the financial world has invented bank-notes, checks, and letters of credit, which pass current for the things they represent, while the savage is still trading only with his actual cowrie-shells, wampum, and hoop-iron, so various devices have been brought into use by which available force can be measured and the result of a conflict be foretold, so that the destined losers submit without a conflict and thus save life and treasure. This is the philosophy of a popular election. . . . Thirty years ago we had an experience in which the metallic power behind the paper ballot had to be actually brought into play. Nobody denied that the election of 1860 was fairly conducted and the result correctly declared. But it turned on an important question, and feeling ran high. Those who found themselves in a minority believed that they were still so numerous and so united, and had so many circumstances in their favor, that they need not submit; and accordingly they refused to do so. Thereupon the majority proceeded to compel them, and though it was an enormous and bloody task, it was carried through to completion, and the minority were convinced — not that they were in the wrong, but simply that they were a minority of the military power as well as of the ballot-casters. If half of Grant's army had fired nothing but blank cartridges, Lee never would have surrendered. . . . These considerations lead directly to the conclusion that woman suffrage would be a serious mistake. A ballot put into the box by a woman would be simply a blank cartridge. . . . In our elections as now held there is no security for the verdict unless the majority is sufficient to assure those who are in the minority that if they refuse to submit they will be coerced. With the proposed extension of the suffrage, if the votes of the women are so divided as not to affect the result, then the women might as well not have voted, and their presence at the polls will be a useless and costly addition to the electoral machinery. On the other hand, if an election is carried by a preponderance of the votes of women, who is to enforce the verdict? When a few such verdicts have been overturned, we shall find ourselves in a state of anarchy. — *Rossiter Johnson.*

PUBLIC INTERESTS SHOULD GOVERN.

WOMEN enter professional or business life as individuals, not as members of a vast corporation. They act for themselves alone; they are responsible only for their own or their families' lives and happiness. But government is the vastest of corporations, managing the business of the whole people, affecting the lives and happiness of all. And therefore the men of the country are as intimately interested, as responsible, when it is proposed to give a half share in its direction to women, as we are ourselves. They have no right to say: "When a majority of women want to vote, we shall let them vote." They ought to say: "We shall let them vote if we too think it is best that they should." And certainly no woman has the same right to ask for political — which means public — power as for personal, private freedom of action. — *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer.*

CONFUSION OF FUNCTIONS.

"IT is a great mistake to suppose that similarity of function is necessary to equality of position or influence. . . . We look with suspicion upon the well-meant movement which, under the appearance of conferring upon woman a right and a symbol of equality with man, imposes on her the performance of duties hitherto accepted and assumed by men. We believe that the division of labor which makes man the breadwinner and the administrator of the State, and gives to woman the administration of the home and of those wider domesticities which are of kin to the home — the hospital, the school, and the like — has its reason in the eternal laws of God, and that no reform is for either her welfare or that of the community which, in its eagerness to affirm the equality of the sexes, confounds their social functions and endeavors to make them duplicate each other. Nor is this general law modified by the fact that in exceptional cases each has nobly assumed and fulfilled the duties which naturally would devolve upon the other." — *The Outlook.*

A GREAT MISFORTUNE.

"AFTER carefully considering all the arguments advanced by the advocates of women's suffrage, I am forced to the conclusion that their case has not yet been made out, and I do not think from the organic difference between men and women that it will ever be shown to be for the advantage of women that they should be forced to take part in political controversies. In fact, I think it would be a great misfortune to them as well as to the human race." — *Abram S. Hewitt.*

TAXES AND VOTES.

"TAXES are the voluntary contributions levied and collected by the State for the protection, benefit, and advancement of the whole community. They are levied alike and in the same proportion upon the property of voters and non-voters, of aliens and citizens, of infants and adults, of men and women.

"In short, there is no relation whatever in fact or theory between taxation and the voting power." — *Francis M. Scott, Esq., New York City.*

IN Connecticut the first year after school suffrage was granted to women, only two and one-half per cent. of the women of voting age exercised the right of suffrage. The second year only about two per cent. went to the polls. Yet the advocates of this measure who appeared before the Legislature insisted that they expressed the desire of the women of the State.